



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,637	09/22/2000	G. Victor Guyan	07752.0019	8161

28164 7590 07/23/2003

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

FRENEL, VANEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/667,637	GUYAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Vanel Frenel	3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED

THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed

- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2000.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the application filed 09/22/00. Claims 1-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 2, 13 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claims 2, 13 and 24 recite the limitation " providing the client with an item tree of line item data based on the line level and aggregating line item level data collected from the claimant". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is needed in the next correspondence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al (5,930,759) in view of Walker et al (6,119,093).

(A) As per claim 1, Moore discloses a method for capture, evaluation and fulfillment of line item level data, the method comprising steps performed by a data processing system (Col.3, lines 17-51), of:

capturing at least one line item data in an insurance host server (Col.6, lines 19-45);

evaluating the line item data (Col.5, lines 41-67). Moore does not explicitly disclose fulfilling the placement of at least one order based on the evaluation of the line item data.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Walker. In particular, Walker suggests fulfilling the placement of at least one order based on the evaluation of the line item data (See Walker, Col.1, lines 42-67 to Col.2, line 37; Col.9, lines 32-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Walker within the system of Moore with the motivation of providing a wide area network communications, such as on the Internet, may be advantageously used by an individual to make a pledge of an unused credit line as collateral for an investment (in particular, the purchase of a share of an insurance policy in syndication) (See Walker, Col.2, lines 45-49).

(B) As per claim 2, Moore discloses the method wherein the step of capturing comprises the steps of:

receiving claim identification information from a claimant, said claim identification information comprising, at least, one line level (Col.4, lines 43-67 to Col.5, lines 51; Col.8, lines 11-43);

storing the line item level data in the insurance host server (Col.6, lines 19-45).

Moore does not explicitly disclose providing the client with an item tree of line item level data based on the line level and aggregating line item level data collected from the claimant.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Walker. In particular, Walker suggests providing the client with an item tree of line item level data based on the line level and aggregating line item level data collected from the claimant (See Walker, Col.1, lines 42-67 to Col.2, line 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Walker within the system of Moore with the motivation of providing a wide area network communications, such as on the Internet, may be advantageously used by an individual to make a pledge of an unused credit line as collateral for an investment (in particular, the purchase of a share of an insurance policy in syndication) (See Walker, Col.2, lines 45-49).

(C) As per claim 3, Moore discloses the method wherein the step of evaluating the line item data comprises the steps of

displaying at least one line item from the insurance host server (Col.9, lines 33-67 to Col.10, line 63); receiving a selection of at least one line item from a claim handler (Col.7, lines 1-67; Col.8, lines 3-67); and

receiving authorization from the claim handler to execute payment of the selected line item, wherein said authorization is for a payment in a form comprising a direct

payment, vendor transfer, line item payment, or preauthorized payment (Col.5, lines 10-51).

(D) As per claim 4, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of fulfilling comprises the steps of:

maintaining a vendor database on the insurance host server (Col.4, lines 47-67 to Col.5, line 64);

placing at least one order for at least one line item from the insurance host server to a vendor (Col.4, lines 47-67 to Col.5, line 64); and

tracking the order on the insurance host server (Col.4, lines 47-67 to Col.5, line 64).

(E) As per claim 5, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of maintaining a vendor database further comprises the step of entering vendor information in the vendor database (Col.6, lines 5-67).

(F) As per claim 6, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of maintaining a vendor database further comprises the step of editing vendor information in the vendor database (Col.5, lines 9-67).

(G) As per claim 7, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of maintaining a vendor database further comprises the step of upgrading a vendor to a preferred vendor in the vendor database (Col.5, lines 29-67 to Col.6, lines 5-67).

(H) As per claim 8, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of placing at least one order further comprises the step of faxing an order to a vendor (Col.5, lines 9-67).

(I) As per claim 9, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of placing at least one order further comprises the step of emailing an order to a vendor (Col.7, lines 1-58).

(J) As per claim 10, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of placing at least one order further comprises the step of placing an order on a web server for vendor access (Col.9, lines 31-67 to Col.10, line 67).

(K) As per claim 11, Walker discloses the method wherein the step of placing at least one order further comprises the step of placing an order with a vendor by electronic data interchange (Col.9, lines 31-67 to Col.10, line 67).

(L) As per claim 12, Moore discloses a system for capturing line item data (Col.3, lines 17-51, comprising: a processor for executing programs (Col.4, lines 43-67 to Col.5, line 51); and a memory for storing a program executable by the processor, the stored program including instructions for (i) capturing at least one line item data in an insurance host server (Col.6, lines 19-67; Col.9, lines 1-61); (ii) evaluating the line item data (Col.3, lines 17-51).

Moore does not explicitly disclose fulfilling the placement of at least one order based on the evaluation of the line item data.

However, this feature is known in the art, as evidenced by Walker. In particular, Walker suggests fulfilling the placement of at least one order based on the evaluation of the line item data (See Walker, Col.1, lines 42-67 to Col.2, line 37; Col.9, lines 32-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the feature of Walker within the system of Moore with the motivation of providing a wide area network communications, such as on the Internet, may be advantageously used by an individual to make a pledge of an unused credit line as collateral for an investment (in particular, the purchase of a share of an insurance policy in syndication) (See Walker, Col.2, lines 45-49).

(M) Claim 23 differs from claim 1 and 12 by reciting a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling a computer system to perform a method for capturing, evaluating, and fulfilling line item data, the method comprising:

As per this limitation Moore discloses capturing at least one line item data in an insurance host server (Col.6, lines 19-45);

evaluating the line item data (Col.5, lines 41-67) and Walker discloses fulfilling the placement of at least one order based on the evaluation of the line item data (See Walker, Col.1, lines 42-67 to Col.2, line 37; Col.9, lines 32-67).

Thus, it is readily apparent that these prior art systems utilize a computer readable medium containing instructions for controlling to perform their specific function.

The remainder of claim 23 is rejected for the same reason given above for claims 1 and 12, and incorporated herein.

(N) Claims 13-22 and 24-33 recite the underlying process steps of the elements of claims 2-11, respectively. As the various elements of claims 2-11 and have been shown to be either disclosed by or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Moore and Walker, it is apparent that the apparatus disclosed by the applied prior art performs the recited underlying functions. As such, the limitations recited in claims 13-22 and 24-33 are rejected for the same reasons given above for the method claims 2-11, and incorporated herein.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches computerized system and method for work management.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vanel Frenel whose telephone number is 703-305-4952. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

V.F
V.F

July 16, 2003


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600